

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-13 and 16-22 are pending. In the office action that was mailed on August 20, 2009, claims 1, 4-13 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 7,243,163 to Friend et al., in view of U.S. patent 6,449,622 to La Rue et al. and in view of U.S. pre-grant publication 2003/0145229 to Cohen.

The claim rejections were made final. This amendment and response is therefore submitted with a Request for Continued Examination under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

The shortened statutory period for responding to the office action ended on November 20, 2009. Since this response is being submitted after that date, the fee for an extension of time in which to respond is also submitted with this response.

In response to the office action, the independent claims have been amended to state that the session state information includes a “sequential number of prior synchronization sessions” and also to state that, the session state information also includes “an expected-session identification value,” which is stated as identifying a next-expected session number for the *other one of the mobile node and network part*. Claims 1 and 21 have further been amended to state that the session state information generator is embodied at a selected one of the network part and the mobile node, the selected one forming a synchronization session

initiator. And, claim 10 has further been amended to state that the other one of the network part and the mobile node forms a synchronization session recipient.

Support for the claim amendments are found in the disclosure, e.g., at page 5, lines 1-3, which states that a synchronization session initiator is formed of either the mobile node or a network device, at page 5, lines 8-9, which states that the device to which a datagram is sent forms a synchronization session recipient, and page 5, lines 10-13 which states that session state information includes a session identification value and an expected-session identification value.

The above-identified amendment, which has been added to independent claims 1 and 21, includes subject matter of old claim 13. And, in the rejection of the claims, the Examiner relied upon Friend for disclosing the subject matter now included in the amended recitation of independent claims 1 and 21. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Friend for showing the amended recitations of claims 1 and 21 and also the corresponding features recited in claim 13.

The Examiner specifically relied upon column 6, line 55-column 7, line 6. But neither this cited portion of Friend, nor elsewhere in the reference, is disclosure made or suggested of a session identification valve or of an expected-session identification value. On page 12 of the office action, the Examiner stated that the Friend reference discloses that limitation and rejected claim 13 as a result. More particularly, on page 12 of the office action, the Examiner

stated that Friend discloses the same limitation in the text of Friend that begins on line 55 of column 6 and which ends at line 5 of column 17.

Neither La Rue nor Cohen were cited for showing, nor appear to show, this feature. Therefore, the Applicants assert that no combination of these references can be created to form the invention recited in claims 1, 13, and 21, as now-presented.

The dependent claims, which include all of the recitations of their respective parent claims, are believed to be distinguishable over the cited combination for the same reason.

In light of the foregoing claim amendments, claims 1, 4-14 and 16-22 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, LP
6600 LBJ Expressway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telp: (214)-446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com